



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,567	03/18/2002	Kyoko Makino	220962US2S	3188
22850	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22314			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/098,567	Applicant(s) MAKINO ET AL.	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/9/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1).

As per claims 1, 11, and 14, Reed discloses a system, computer readable medium, and method of document analysis by a computer including referring to term definition dictionary data including summary elements defined as elements to be extracted in order to be included in a summary (See Reed, Figure 2, element 2, and Column 3, lines 59-64), and extracting the summary elements included in the document data to be analyzed (See Reed, Column 4, lines 16-55). Reed also discloses combining the extracted summary elements and generating summary information of the document data to be analyzed (See Reed; Figure 2, element 6, and Column 3, lines 64-67, Column 4, lines 1-5). Reed does not disclose expressly that the summary elements are extracted in accordance with a predetermined rule, or that the document data to be analyzed is linked with the summary information. Yanase discloses analyzing a document based on predetermined rules (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0079).

Yanase also discloses linking the document data to be analyzed with the summary information (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0078). Reed and Yanase are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the analysis of a document based on predetermined rules and the linking of the document data with the summary information of Yanase with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the separation between various types of information within a document, such as titles and body of text (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0080), and to allow the user to access additional document data which is not displayed on the screen due to a restricted display area (See Yanase, Page 6, paragraph 0116). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yanase with Reed for the benefit of distinguishing between data segments within a document and accessing additional data within a document to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 11, and 14.

Claims 2-10, 12-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed (U.S. Patent 6,397,209 B1) in view of Yanase (U.S. Publication 2001/0025288 A1), Thomson (U.S. Patent 5,634,051) and Chen (U.S. Patent 6,009,442).

As per claims 2, 12, 13, and 15, Reed discloses a system, computer readable medium, and method of document analysis by a computer including receiving document data to be analyzed including index information indicative of a category under which the

document falls (See Reed, Column 3, lines 64-67, Column 4, lines 1-2, and Claim 4), referring to term definition dictionary data including summary elements defined as elements to be extracted in order to be included in a summary (See Reed, Figure 2, element 2, and Column 3, lines 59-64), and extracting the summary elements included in the document data to be analyzed (See Reed, Column 4, lines 16-55). Reed also discloses combining the extracted summary elements and generating summary information of the document data to be analyzed (See Reed, Figure 2, element 6, and Column 3, lines 64-67, Column 4, lines 1-5). Reed also discloses when a designation of the category is received from the user, searching the document data that falls under the designated category based on the index information (See Reed Column 3, lines 5-8, and lines 15-35). Reed does not disclose expressly that the summary elements are extracted in accordance with a predetermined rule, or that the document data to be analyzed is linked with the summary information. Reed also does not disclose expressly searching the summary information corresponding to the searched document data based on a link result between the document data and the summary information, and generating screen data including the search document data, the category under which the searched document data falls, and the searched summary information. Yanase discloses analyzing a document based on predetermined rules (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0079). Yanase also discloses linking the document data to be analyzed with the summary information (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0078). Thomson discloses searching summary information corresponding to searched document data based on a category type which links the document data and the

summary information (See Thomson Column 7, lines 45-57). Thomson also discloses generating screen data including the search document data, the category under which the searched document data falls, and a portion of the document as determined by the user. (See Thomson, Column 2, lines 65-67, Column 3, lines 1-3, and Figure 3). Chen discloses displaying document summary information resulting from a search. Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the analysis of a document based on predetermined rules and the linking of the document data with the summary information of Yanase with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine the separation between various types of information within a document, such as titles and body of text (See Yanase, Page 4, paragraph 0080), to allow the user to access additional document data which is not displayed on the screen due to a restricted display area (See Yanase, Page 6, paragraph 0116). It also would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the search method and generation of screen data of Thomson and Chen with the system and method of Reed. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to enter a description of the information needed using simple words or phrases and to rely on the system to generate the full search query (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 35-46), subsequently displaying the results to the user on the screen including the summary data in order to allow the user to quickly and efficiently browse a collection of documents (See Chen, Column 2, lines 13-17). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2176

been obvious to combine Yanase, Thomson and Chen with Reed for the benefit of distinguishing between data segments within a document and accessing additional data within a document, and for allowing a user to enter information from which a full search is formulated and the results presented to the user to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2, 13, and 15.

As per claim 3, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Thomson also discloses that the code characterizes a portion of the document data that corresponds to the summary information included in the screen data (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 52-53). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the portion of document data corresponding to the summary information in the screen data of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson, and Chen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to request to view a complete document selected from the list by inputting a command indicative of this request (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 53-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen for the benefit of allowing the user to request a complete document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

As per claim 4, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Thomson also discloses that the code generates the screen data that makes the user hierarchically designate search keys for use in search

of the document data, searches the document data based on the search keys, searches the summary information corresponding to the searched document based on the linked result between the document data and the summary information, and generates the screen data including the searched document and the searched summary information (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 47-60, Column 2, lines 65-67, Column 3, lines 1-3, and Figure 3). Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the hierarchical designation of search keys by the user of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson, and Chen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to examine the search results in multiple formats (See Thomson, Column 2, lines 65-67, and Column 3, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen for the benefit of allowing the user to examine the search results in multiple formats to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

As per claims 5 and 6, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen disclose the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Thomson also discloses that when a search key in an arbitrary hierarchy is designated by the user, the code generates the screen data that makes the user designate a next search key from a search key in a hierarchy of an order lower than the arbitrary hierarchy and the search key in the arbitrary hierarchy (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 63-64). Thomson also discloses that when a search key in an arbitrary hierarchy is designated by the user, the code searches the

Art Unit: 2176

document data based on the search key designated in the arbitrary hierarchy and a search key designated in a hierarchy of an order higher than the arbitrary hierarchy before the arbitrary hierarchy is designated (See Thomson, Column 6, lines 61-62).

Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing and presenting electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the designation of a next search key in a hierarchical order either lower or higher than the arbitrary hierarchy of Thomson with the system and method of Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to execute search strategies using a broader or more narrow concept (See Thomson, Column 7, lines 23-26, and Column 6, lines 61-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thomson with Reed, Yanase, Thomson, and Chen for the benefit of allowing the user to execute varying levels of concepts to search to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 6.

As per claim 7, Reed, Yanase, Thomson and Chen disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Reed also discloses that when a designation of the category from the user is received, searches the document data that falls under the designated category based on the index information, and generates the screen data including the searched document, the category under which the searched document data falls, and the searched summary information (See Reed, Column 3, lines 5-8, and lines 15-35).

Claim 8 is rejected on the same basis as claim 4.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Claim 10 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Merrill (U.S. Publication 2002/0036694 A1) discloses a method and system for the storage and retrieval of Web-based educational materials.
- Meystel (U.S. Publication 2001/0056445 A1) discloses a system and method for text structuring and text generation.
- Doi (U.S. Patent 5,077,668) discloses a method and apparatus for producing an abstract of a document.
- Sumita (U.S. Patent 5,907,836) discloses an information filtering apparatus for selecting a predetermined article from plural articles to present the selected article to the user.
- Boguraev (U.S. Patent 6,393,824 B1) discloses a method for dynamic presentation of the contents of a number of documents on a display.
- Kupiec discloses a trainable document summarizer.
- Dourish discloses extending document management systems with user-specific active properties.
- Labrou discloses using *Yahoo!* Categories to describe documents.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER